

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

COLUMBIA DIVISION

WINDOLN G. HASTIE,

]

Plaintiff,

]

-vs-

]

CA NO: 3:04-21923-^{MJP}~~BM~~

ORDER

CENTRAL CAROLINA TECHNICAL
COLLEGE,

]

]

Defendant.

]

This is an employment discrimination case filed by the plaintiff Windoln G. Hastie pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. The matter is before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant. The Magistrate Judge recommends the Court deny the Defendant's motion for summary judgment. The Defendant objects to the Magistrate Judge's recommendation.

As to his findings on dispositive matters, the Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Recommendation to which specific objection is made.

Here, Plaintiff has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. The Court has carefully reviewed the record before it as well as the Defendant's objections. In addition,

the Court has reviewed the thorough Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge wherein he recommends that the Court deny the Defendant's motion for summary. Upon review, the Court has determined that genuine issues of fact exist. Accordingly, the Court is of the opinion that the Defendant's motion for summary judgment should be and is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/MATTHEW J. PERRY, JR.
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
September 28, 2006.